

**REMARKS**

With this Amendment, Applicants cancel claims 7 and 14-17, amend claims 8-13, and add new claims 18 and 19. Therefore, claims 8-13, 18, and 19 are all the claims currently pending in this Application.

**Claim Amendments and New Claims**

Claims 18 and 19 are added and are fully supported in the originally-filed specification and claims. Claims 8-13 are amended. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request entry of these claims.

**Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 7-12, 14, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Tanabe (U.S. Patent 6,835,112) in view of Fujii (JP 03192689). Claims 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Coghlan (U.S. Publication 2002/0190636). Applicants submit that currently pending claims 8-13, 18, and 19 are patentable over the cited references.

Regarding independent claim 18, the references fail to teach or suggest drying the light emitting layer such that particles are made to protrude upwards forming an undulating upper surface and heating the light emitting and insulating layers, sintering the light emitting layer such that the particles sink into the insulating layer, as claimed.

Regarding the Fujii reference, the methods of Fujii result in that amounts to an intermediate step (e.g. illustrated in Fig. 3d of the present Application) of the present invention. Fujii describes a prior art method in which an insulating layer 2 is deposited on an electrode 1, a luminance layer 3 is deposited on the insulating layer, and a transparent electrode 4 is deposited

on the luminance layer. Fujii describes that these prior art layers are uneven, as illustrated causing unwanted irregular illumination, damage to the insulating layer causing shorts, and low efficiency. The unevenness in the layers is due to the inhomogeneous layers of the insulating layer and the luminance layer. The purpose of Fujii's invention is to eliminate these irregularities by adding a surfactant to either or both of the insulating layer and the phosphor (luminance) layer.

Regarding the prior art method and apparatus as described in Fujii, as noted above, the irregularities are due to the inhomogeneous ink used in creating the insulating layer and the luminance layer. In other words, the insulating layer was already bumpy when the light emitting layer was applied. Thus, the particles of the light emitting layer appear to protrude downward because the insulating layer itself is irregular. There is no teaching or suggestion of drying the light emitting layer such that particles are made to protrude upwards forming an undulating upper surface and heating the light emitting and insulating layers, sintering the light emitting layer such that the particles sink into the insulating layer, as claimed.

Regarding the Fujii invention as described, there is also no teaching or suggestion of drying the light emitting layer such that particles are made to protrude upwards forming an undulating upper surface and heating the light emitting and insulating layers, sintering the light emitting layer such that the particles sink into the insulating layer, as claimed. Rather, all steps of the Fujii invention are for the purpose of eliminating irregularities.

Regarding the Tanabe reference, in Tanabe, the phosphor particles are spread on a binder-polymer layer and then the binder-polymer layer is heated so that the phosphor particles sink into their own binder, rather than into a separate insulating layer, as in the present invention.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Tanabe of drying the light emitting layer such that particles are made to protrude upwards forming an undulating upper surface and heating the light emitting and insulating layers, sintering the light emitting layer such that the particles sink into the insulating layer, as claimed.

Coghlan fails to remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of Fujii and Tanabe.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 18 is patentable over the cited references and that claims 8-13, and 19 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence. Applicants respectfully request that the claim rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Request for Interview**

Applicants respectfully request an interview with Examiner Erdem regarding the above-discussed issues. Applicants request that the Examiner contact Applicants' representative, Laura Moskowitz at 202-857-3224, to schedule an interview.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**

**Q85546**

Application No.: 10/519,363

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura Moskowitz  
Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 23, 2007